



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,407	03/14/2001	Takuro Tamura	033808/027 8720	3695

7590 10/07/2003

REED SMITH
Stanley Fisher
3110 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE
SUITE 1400
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042

EXAMINER

SIEW, JEFFREY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1637

12

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/808,407

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Jeffrey Siew

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lockhart et al (Nature Biotechnology vol. 14 pp. 1 1675-1680 1996).

Lockhart et al teach a method of displaying results In which a plurality of probe biopolymers immobilized on a biochip are hybridized to a sample biopolymer comprising step of displaying information obtained in hybridization experiment about a hybridization level for each probe with similarity score representing similarity of base sequences.(see whole document teaching arrays with measuring level of hybridization signal (see figure 3 and 5 and they teach phycoerythrin and fluorescein emissions in experimental protocol).

The term “hybridization level” and “similarity score” reads broadly to cover Lockhart et al’s teaching of hybridization intensities.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schena et al (Science vol. 270 pp. 467-470 1995)

Schena al teach a method of displaying results In which a plurality of probe biopolymers immobilized on a biochip are hybridized to a sample biopolymer comprising step of displaying

Art Unit: 1637

information obtained in hybridization experiment about a hybridization level for each probe with similarity score representing similarity of base sequences. (see whole document 1 and they teach fluorescein emissions on page 468). They also teach showing the display of plurality of biochips(see figure 1).

The term “hybridization level” and “similarity score” reads broadly to cover Schena et al’s teaching of hybridization intensities.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slater et al (US 6,448,387 Sept, 10,2002).

Slater al teach a method of displaying results In which a plurality of probe biopolymers immobilized on a biochip are hybridized to a sample biopolymer comprising step of displaying information obtained in hybridization experiment about a hybridization level for each probe with similarity score representing similarity of base sequences. (See whole document teaching arrays with measuring level of hybridization signal of different dyes). They also teach showing the display of plurality of biochips(see figure 1).

The term “hybridization level” and “similarity score” reads broadly to cover Slater et al’s teaching of hybridization intensities.

Art Unit: 1637

4. The response filed 7/23/03 has been fully considered and deemed not persuasive. The response states that the Lockhart, Schena and Slater et al reference does not teach or mention similarity score. As stated previously similarity score reads broadly and would encompass hybridization level. Hybridization level is measure of a similarity score in that it represents a measure of the level of complementariness between a probe and target. Lockhart et al's teaching of hybridization intensity reflects such a score. They teach exact scores or values in Figure 3 and 4 which represent the level of probe to target binding which is representative of the level of similarity between the oligonucleotide probes and their respective gene targets. Similarly in Schena they teach expression levels in Table 2 which represent the level of similarity between the microarray probes to the targets. In Slater they teach measuring hybridization intensities which is a measure of the similarity of the probe and targets (see example 1). The rejections are maintained. Perhaps further amendments to incorporating active steps that define a specific type of similarity score may offer a more promising avenue to overcoming the prior art.

SUMMARY

5. No claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Siew whose telephone number is (703) 305-3886 and whose e-mail address is Jeffrey.Siew@uspto.gov. However, the office cannot guarantee security through the e-mail system nor should official papers be transmitted through this route. The examiner is on flex-time schedule and can best be reached on weekdays from 6:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached on (703)-308-1119.

Art Unit: 1637

Any inquiry of a general nature, matching or filed papers or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tracey Johnson for Art Unit 1637 whose telephone number is (703)-305-2982.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Center numbers for Group 1600 are Voice (703) 308-3290 and Before Final FAX (703) 872-9306 or After Final FAX (703) 30872-9307.


JEFFREY SIEW
PRIMARY EXAMINER

October 4, 2003